

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/690,667	MACWILLIAMS, STEVEN	
	Examiner Monica S. Carter	Art Unit 3722	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Monica S. Carter. (3) _____.

(2) Michael Lasky. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Swallow (5,820,958) and Cunningham (3,348,324).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MONICA CARTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Lasky stated that the Swallow reference fails to disclose a foldable label as claimed. Mrs. Carter agreed that Swallow should be removed as reading on the claimed invention. Mr. Lasky stated that the Cunningham reference fails to disclose the first and second layers of the label having different light transmissibility. Mrs. Carter stated that this feature will be searched in an updated search. Mr. Lasky stated that he would be willing to cancel claim 4 and include those limitations into independent claim 1. An updated search will be conducted and should an applicable reference be discovered, Mr. Lasky will be contacted.